

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 8, 2005. Claims 1-30 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-29 were rejected, and Claim 30 was objected to. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicant amends Claims 1, 11, 22, 27, 29 and 30, and Applicant adds new Claims 31-40. Thus, Claims 1-40 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

**SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner maintains an objection to the title of the invention. In this regard, the Examiner states that the present title is not descriptive. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, Applicant has amended the title to that suggested by the Examiner: "Portable Computer System with Integrated Antenna." Favorable action is respectfully requested.

**SECTION 102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,456,499 issued to Nakajima et al. (hereinafter "*Nakajima*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that *Nakajima* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of the independent Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22.

Independent Claim 1 recites "a bezel having a bezel flange adapted to support a screen member" and "an antenna disposed at least partially between the bezel flange and the screen member." *Nakajima* appears to disclose a portable computer 1 (e.g., a laptop computer) having a computer body 2 and a display unit 3 (*Nakajima*, column 4, lines 46-51, figure 1). The display unit 3 of *Nakajima* appears to include a display housing 6 as a casing for a liquid display module 7 where the housing 6 of *Nakajima* is formed of a display cover 8 and a

display mask 9 (*Nakajima*, column 4, lines 56-63, figure 1). Applicant respectfully submits that *Nakajima* does not appear to disclose or even suggest “an antenna disposed at least partially between the bezel flange and the screen member” as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). Thus, for at least this reason, *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 11 recites “means for supporting a screen member” and “antenna means disposed at least partially between a flange of the supporting means and an interior surface of the screen member” (emphasis added), and independent Claim 16 recites “providing a screen member having an antenna disposed on an interior surface thereof” and “providing a bezel having a bezel flange adapted to support the screen member, at least a portion of the antenna disposed between the bezel flange and the screen member” (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claims 11 and 16.

Independent Claim 22 recites “a screen,” “a display device disposed adjacent an interior surface of the screen” and “an antenna disposed on the interior surface of the screen.” *Nakajima* does not appear to disclose or even suggest “a screen” and “a display device disposed adjacent an interior surface of the screen” or “an antenna disposed on the interior surface of the screen” as recited by Claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 22 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9, 12, 13, 15, 17-20, 23-27 and 29 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22 are also not anticipated by *Nakajima* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22 and also additional elements that further distinguish *Nakajima*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of Claims 2-9, 12, 13, 15, 17-20, 23-27 and 29 is improper and should be withdrawn.

**SECTION 103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 10, 21 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakajima* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,689 issued to Chen (hereinafter “*Chen*”). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakajima*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 10, 14, 21 and 28 depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 16 and 22. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claims 1, 16 and 22 are in condition for allowance and, therefore, Claims 10, 21 and 28 that depend respectively therefrom are also in condition for allowance. Moreover, *Chen* does not appear to remedy at least the deficiencies of *Nakajima* discussed above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 10, 21 and 28 be withdrawn.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner objected to Claim 30 as being dependent on a rejected base claim (Claim 22). Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, as discussed above, independent Claim 22 is patentable over the cited reference. Therefore, Claim 30 which depends from independent Claim 22 is also patentable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

**NEW CLAIMS**

Applicants add new Claims 31-40. New Claims 32-34 depend from new independent Claim 30, and new Claims 36-40 depend from new independent Claim 35. Applicant respectfully submits that new independent Claims 31 and 35 are patentable over the cited references and, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new independent Claims 31 and 35, and Claims 32-34 and 36-40 that depend respectively therefrom.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

An RCE filing fee of \$1690.00 is believed due. The Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company the amount of \$1690.00 to satisfy the RCE filing fee. If, however, Applicants have miscalculated the fee due with this RCE, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this RCE to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
James L. Baudino  
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: October 12, 2005

Correspondence to:  
L.Joy Griebenow  
Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400  
Tel. 970-898-3884